REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-31 remain pending in the application.

<u>Claims 1-4, 6, 7-14, and 16-31 variously over Lohtia, Whitington, Degraeve, and Barr</u>

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 10-12, 19-21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,560,456 to Lohtia et al. ("Lohtia") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,131,028 to Whitington ("Whitington"), and further in view of U.S. Application Pub. No. 2001/0049274 to Degraeve ("Degraeve"); claims 3, 4, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22, 25, 28 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lohtia in view of Whitington and Degraeve, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,456,852 to Bar et al. ("Bar"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Applicants respectfully contend that the need for <u>THREE</u> references to reject claims 1, 2, 10-12, 19-21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29 and 30 is an indication of the <u>NON</u>-obviousness of the claimed features.

Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22, 25, 28 and 31 are respectively dependent on claims 1, 11, 20, 23, 26 and 29, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11, 20, 23, 26 and 29.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7-14, and 16-31 recite, *inter alia*, retrieval of a <u>location based message</u> associated with an <u>obtained current location</u> of a subscriber device <u>and</u> selected using <u>at least one auxiliary digit</u>, with an information telephone call comprising <u>dialed digits "4-1-1" suffixed</u> by the at least one auxiliary digit.

Thus, the claimed features require retrieving a <u>location based</u> message based on TWO elements: (1) an <u>obtained current location</u> and (2) <u>at least one auxiliary digit suffixed to dialed digits "4-1-1".</u>

Dialed digits "4-1-1" allows a call to be routed to a specific destination. In particular, dialed digits "4-1-1" allow a call to be <u>routed</u> to an information retrieval destination, conventionally being directory assistance. Conventional directory assistance <u>routing</u> techniques can continue be utilized to

route an information telephone call using the claimed features, with the additional benefits of being able to retrieve a location message based on at least one auxiliary digit suffixed to dialed digits "4-1-1". Suffixing at least one auxiliary digit to dialed digits "4-1-1" allows an information telephone to be routed as a conventional "4-1-1" information telephone call, but with additional capabilities provided by at least one auxiliary digit suffixed to dialed digits "4-1-1". Thus, suffixing at least one auxiliary digit to dialed digits "4-1-1" provides significant benefits over the cited reference – not taught or suggested by suffixing a digit to just any number, as discussed in more detail below.

The Examiner acknowledged that Lohtia, Whitington, and Degraeve fail to teach <u>dialed digits "4-1-1"</u>. Since Lohtia, Whitington, and Degraeve fail to teach <u>dialed digits "4-1-1"</u>, Lohtia, Whitington, and Degraeve also fail to teach <u>an information telephone call comprising dialed digits "4-1-1" suffixed by at least one auxiliary digit</u>, as required by all of the pending claims.

The Examiner relies on Barr to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Lohtia, Whitington, and Degraeve. The Examiner relies on Barr to allegedly teach <u>dialed digits "4-1-1"</u>. (see Office Action, page 10)

A thorough reading reveals that Barr fails to teach auxiliary digits <u>suffixed</u> to an information telephone number. Barr teaches nothing more than a <u>conventional</u> directory assistance call dialed digits "4-1-1" — not retrieving a **location based** message that is associated with **TWO** types of data, i.e., (1) an **obtained current** location and (2) at least one auxiliary digit **suffixed** to **dialed digits "4-1-1"**, as required by claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-31.

Lohtia, Whitington, Degraeve and Barr, either alone or in combination, fail disclose, teach or suggest retrieval of a <u>location based message</u> associated with an <u>obtained current location</u> of a subscriber device <u>and</u> selected using <u>at least one auxiliary digit</u>, with an information telephone call comprising <u>dialed digits "4-1-1" suffixed</u> by the <u>at least one auxiliary digit</u>, as recited by claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-31.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-31 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 16 over Lohtia, Whitington, Degraeve and Tell

In the Office Action, claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lohtia in view of Whitington and Degraeve, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,802 to Tell et al. ("Tel"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 6 and 16 are dependent upon claims 1 and 11 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 11.

Claims 6 and 16 recite, *inter alia*, retrieval of a <u>location based</u> <u>message</u> associated with an <u>obtained current location</u> of a subscriber device <u>and</u> selected using <u>at least one auxiliary digit</u>, with an information telephone call comprising <u>dialed digits "4-1-1" suffixed</u> by the <u>at least one auxiliary digit</u>. As discussed above, Lohtia, Whitington and Degraeve, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest such features.

Tell is relied on to allegedly teaches location of a wireless device using an angle of arrival. (see Office Action, page 14) Thus, even in view of Tell's alleged teaching, Lohtia, Whitington, Degraeve and Tell, either alone or in combination, fail disclose, teach or suggest retrieval of a <u>location based message</u> associated with an <u>obtained current location</u> of a subscriber device <u>and</u> selected using <u>at least one auxiliary digit</u>, with an information telephone call comprising <u>dialed digits "4-1-1" suffixed</u> by the at least one auxiliary digit, as recited by claims 6 and 16.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6 and 16 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Bollman

Reg. No.: 36,457 Tel. (202) 261-1020

Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC 2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor Washington D.C. 20036-3307 WHB/df